

Social Science Research Review



Volume 1, Number 2 Spring/Summer 1999

Race, Ethnicity and Use of the National Park System

Dr. Myron Floyd Texas A&M University

Abstract

This paper reviews the social science literature on racial and ethnic minority use of the National Park System. Four theoretical perspectives are examined—the marginality hypothesis, subcultural hypothesis, assimilation theory, and the discrimination hypothesis. Each perspective is described, and its strengths and limitations discussed. Research on race, ethnicity, and participation in outdoor recreation is also examined. Studies consistently show that racial and ethnic groups visit national parks and participate in recreation activities at differing rates. The style and pattern of park use also vary among racial and ethnic groups. Social science research on this topic can help park managers serve the diversity of recreation needs, preferences, and styles associated with diverse racial and ethnic groups.

Introduction and Scope

The National Park System has been heralded as a unique collection of natural and cultural treasures reserved for the benefit of the American people. In recent years, a challenging issue facing the National Park Service (NPS) has been how to make National Park System sites accessible to a broader segment of the U.S. population—particularly racial and ethnic minorities. The racial and ethnic makeup of the U.S. population is more diverse now than at any time in the 20th century (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1994). Nearly 1 in 4 U.S. citizens identified themselves as Black, Hispanic, Asian and Pacific Islander, or American Indian in the 1990

census. By 2050, ethnic minority groups are expected to comprise more than 47% of the U.S. population while accounting for nearly 9 of every 10 persons added to the population (Murdock 1995). Yet, racial and ethnic minorities are largely absent among visitor populations of most national parks (Goldsmith 1994). As stated in the National Park Service 1997 Strategic Plan, the low visibility of racial and ethnic minorities in national parks:

...is an important cultural and social issue because parks have historically been used mainly by the white middle class segment of the population, and many parks do not attract and offer park experiences meaningful to visitors from varied ethnic backgrounds, or have not yet made their park values relevant to them (U.S. Department of the Interior 1997:55).

To effectively serve an increasingly diverse public, and to prepare for a more ethnically pluralistic 21st century, the NPS will need a thorough, science-based understanding of factors impacting minority use of the national parks. This is critical for two reasons. First, as a public agency, the NPS must ensure that its management policies promote equal access to parks for members of all racial and ethnic groups. Second, racial and ethnic groups differ in patterns of participation and style of park use. As visitors and potential visitors become more racially and ethnically diverse, NPS managers will need information on these varying groups of visitors to create inclusive environments.

The task of this paper is to review the social science literature related to racial and ethnic minority use of national parks. The review focuses on three specific areas of this literature:

• theoretical perspectives available for understanding minority use of national parks,

- relevant empirical findings on the use of NPS sites by racial and ethnic minorities, and
- research methods used in investigations of minority use of national parks.

The paper concludes by identifying gaps in the literature and offers recommendations for future social science research on minority use of national parks.

The review is restricted to research that focuses on the relationship between race, ethnicity, and use of national parks, or comparable areas and activities commonly associated with national parks. Studies that have focused on racial/ethnic differences in more general leisure activities are included only if they provide findings directly relevant to national park use.

It is important to call attention to two key points concerning the literature on ethnic minority participation. First, the terms race, ethnicity, and minority groups are often used interchangeably in the literature and are often not adequately defined. As a result, these concepts and their association with recreation participation and national park use are often confounded. [These and other terms that may be unfamiliar to the reader are highlighted in bold face and defined in a glossary at the end of the paper.] Feagin (1989) offers the following distinctions. He refers to race (or racial group) as a social group distinguished or set apart, by others or by itself, primarily on the basis of real or perceived physical characteristics. It is important to note that such characteristics have no inherent bearing on an individual's behavior. Rather, they are important because they become the basis for social categorization and discrimination. An ethnic group (or ethnicity) is defined as a social group set apart on the basis of cultural or nationality characteristics. Thus, there is not necessarily a relationship between race and ethnicity. For example, Hispanic Americans can be of any race while sharing ethnic ties to Latin America and a Spanish-origin (Gramann 1996). The commonality between race and ethnicity is that both cultural and physical characteristics can serve as a basis for unequal treatment in society. A **minority group** is one who, because of its race or ethnicity, experiences a wide range of discriminatory treatment and is assigned to a low status position in the broader society (Yetman 1985). In the U.S., a minority group is also a numerical minority usually referring to African Americans, Hispanic Americans, American Indians or Native Americans, and Asian

Americans. [For consistency, the terms White, African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, and Native American will be used throughout this review when comparing racial groups. In comparisons between ethnic groups, the distinction will be made between White, non-Hispanics, and Hispanic Americans.]

Neglect of the distinction between race and ethnicity has hampered efforts to understand minority participation in outdoor recreation. As Gramann (1996:3) noted, "virtually every published study of ethnicity and recreation before the late 1980s [used] race as an indicator of ethnicity" largely relying on either White/African American or White/African American/"other" comparisons. As a result, there is not a broad base of research information on ethnic minority populations beyond African Americans. Moreover, it becomes difficult to determine whether group differences in recreation participation can be attributed to factors associated with race (e.g., prejudice and discrimination) or cultural factors associated with ethnic ancestral values and beliefs.

The second point to consider is the lack of empirical studies on ethnic minority use of national parks. Since the 1960s, social scientists have directed research attention to the study of racial and ethnic minority participation in leisure-time activities. Four major journals cover social science aspects of leisure and recreation behavior. Of the 2,107 articles published in these journals, 68 (3.2%) address some aspect of race or ethnicity. Eleven of these 68 articles are based on studies involving some aspect of race or ethnicity and outdoor/nature-based recreation. Obviously, papers on the association between race or ethnicity and recreation behavior appear in other journals, monographs, or technical reports. They are few in number, however. Thus, it is necessary to draw upon research findings from the broader literature, including unpublished data and findings from non-NPS sites, to learn about behavioral patterns relevant to national parks.

This paper is organized into four sections. The first section provides an overview of theoretical perspectives used to explain minority use of national parks. The second section reviews research findings from studies of ethnic minority use of national parks, participation in outdoor recreation activities, and on-site use patterns. The third section reviews research methods used in these studies and also describes alternative methods. Fourth, significant knowledge gaps in the literature are identi-

fied. The paper concludes with a summary and implications drawn from the current literature.

Theoretical Perspectives on Minority Use of National Parks

Research on minority use of national parks and minority participation in outdoor recreation has been viewed from four theoretical perspectives. A summary of these perspectives is presented in Table 1. A description of each perspective is provided below.

The Marginality Hypothesis

The marginality hypothesis holds that low participation in wildland recreation among ethnic minorities results from limited access to socioeconomic resources which, in turn, result from historical patterns of discrimination (Washburne 1978). This perspective was developed initially to explain differences in the rate of wildland recreation participation between Whites and African Americans. It recognizes that past sanctioned and unsanctioned discrimination were barriers to full participation in society's major social and cultural institutions by racial and ethnic minorities. An appealing aspect of this perspective is that indicators of differential access to socioeconomic resources are easily measured. Examples of marginality indicators used in previous research include income, employment status and occupational status, and access to transportation (Scott and Munson 1994; West 1989; Johnson et al. 1998). Marginality has also been measured by educational attainment, since greater awareness of parks and other recreation opportunities is associated with individuals or groups that have higher levels of education attainment.

Tests of the marginality hypothesis typically involve comparing rates of participation in wildland activities between Whites and African Americans (or another minority group), while controlling for socioeconomic (i.e., marginality) factors. Since the marginality hypothesis assumes that differences between the two groups are related to socioeconomic factors, Whites and African Americans of similar socioeconomic status are expected to exhibit similar rates of participation. Findings consistent with this expectation are interpreted as support for the marginality hypothesis. If differences in participation rates persist, despite controls for socio-

economic factors, there is evidence that other factors beyond marginality account for interracial variations.

Although the marginality hypothesis provides some perspective on reasons for low rates of national park visitation among minority groups, it has several limitations. First, while it addresses the pervasiveness of discrimination in earlier time periods, it does not suggest how contemporary discrimination (actual or perceived) experienced by members of minority groups may affect visitation patterns. Second, the marginality hypothesis does not apply to cases where income or other socioeconomic constraints are less relevant. Thus, it is not clear how to account for affluent individuals who may have the economic means to visit national parks but choose not to. Third, it is not clear how the hypothesis applies to on-site use patterns, where low visitation is not a critical issue. Finally, the marginality hypothesis was developed to explain differences between the dominant group and minority groups. It does not promote understanding of variation within specific minority populations.

It is interesting to note that the marginality hypothesis, and comparative research on minority recreation participation in general, tends to describe minority participation in terms of "under-participation." As Gramann (1996) suggests, participation by Whites in wildland recreation could just as easily be described as "overrepresentation" or "over-participation." Woodard (1993) maintains that not only are the terms "under-participation" or "under-representation" inherently biased, but they can potentially misdirect research and management efforts away from understanding intra-racial and intra-ethnic recreation preferences and patterns of use.

The Subcultural Hypothesis

The **subcultural** hypothesis (also known as the ethnicity hypothesis) directs research attention to the cultural factors associated with the formation of outdoor recreation preferences. It suggests that racial and ethnic differences in recreation behaviors can be attributed to different norms, value systems, and socialization practices adhered to by racial and ethnic groups, independent of socioeconomic factors. It has been argued that the same values that attract Whites to national parks engender indifference toward parks among people of color. In a 1973 essay, Meeker suggested that while Whites view parks as places for refuge and es-

Table 1. Summary of theoretical perspectives on minority use of national parks

Theoretical perspectives	Key assumptions	Strengths	Weaknesses
Marginality hypothesis	Lack of socioeconomic resources and historical discrimination limit park visitation.	Addresses role of historical discrimination Direct measures of marginality factors are suggested	Does not address contemporary discrimination Not clear how to apply to affluent individuals and groups Implications for explaining on-site use not clear
Subcultural hypothesis	Vistitation patterns reflect differences in values, norms, and socialization patterns (independent of socioeconomic factors).	Directs attention to cultural determinants of outdoor recreation preferences	Specific cultural determinants often not identified or measured Neglects intra-ethnic diversity
Assimilation theory	Park use reflects an acquisition of the dominant culture's characteristics.	Well-established in the literature Accounts for intra-ethnic diversity Suggests measurable indicators of cultural characteristics	Associated with ideological assumptions Implications for non-immigrant populations not understood
Discrimination hypothesis	Park visitation is affected by perceived, actual, or institutional discrimination.	Directs attention to contemporary forms of discrimination	Little is known of the range, types, and responses to contemporary discrimination

cape from urban stressors, African Americans and Native Americans display little enthusiasm for parks and wilderness because these places are reminders of their subjugation and oppression (Meeker 1973). Similar arguments have been advanced more recently by Taylor (1989) and Johnson (1998).

Subcultural influences have also been interpreted as processes which lead to the preservation or maintenance of ethnic identity. For example, Washburne and Wall (1980) suggest that leisure activities and sites for leisure activities may be used by one ethnic group as a way to demarcate and contrast itself from other groups. In addition, some activities and sites might be defined as inappropriate because they do not reinforce an ethnic group's collective identity. Similarly, researchers have argued that leisure may play a critical role in maintaining subcultural identity in a multi-cultural society (Floyd and Gramann 1993). Because decisions about leisure activities are made in relative freedom and are

less subject to conformity pressures found in work, education, and other settings (Kelly 1987), it is likely that ethnic differences will be reflected in choices of leisure activities and settings.

Despite the attention it directs to cultural factors (rather than socioeconomic factors), the subcultural hypothesis does not provide clear guidance for identifying and measuring specific variables that affect visitation and park use patterns. The research approach commonly used to identify subcultural effects is to interpret as cultural differences those significant differences that remain after controlling for socioeconomic factors between Whites and an ethnic minority group. This is a critical weakness because the residual difference is interpreted as cultural without specifying which aspect of ethnic culture affects participation. Another limitation of the subcultural hypothesis is that diversity within ethnic groups is not fully recognized.

Assimilation Theory

Recently, a number of studies have employed assimilation theory to explain ethnic patterns in recreation participation. **Assimilation** refers to "the process of boundary reduction that can occur when members of two or more societies or of smaller cultural groups meet" (Yinger 1981:249). In one of the most widely referenced theories of assimilation, Gordon (1964) breaks the assimilation process into seven distinct subprocesses (cultural, structural, marital, attitudinal reception, behavioral reception, identification, and civic assimilation). The concepts of cultural and structural assimilation have been employed in studies of outdoor recreation participation. Cultural assimilation (also known as acculturation) refers to minority group acquisition of cultural characteristics of the majority group, such as language, diet, and religion (Gordon 1964). Structural assimilation describes the extent of social interaction between majority and minority groups in primary (i.e., family and friendships) or secondary social groups (i.e., school, work, or residential). These concepts have been useful in directing attention to specific and measurable indicators of ethnic culture. They can also be used to account for differences within ethnic groups, since individual members of an ethnic group often exhibit varying degrees of acculturation or structural assimilation. Assimilation theory has been particularly effective in studies involving Hispanic American groups, and hold potential for other ethnic groups with distinct cultural characteristics, such as language, foreign birth, or recent immigration experiences. It is not clear from the literature whether or how the assimilation perspective applies to African Americans or Native Americans.

The general hypothesis derived from assimilation theory is that greater assimilation among ethnic minorities leads to patterns of recreation participation similar to the majority population. Applying this perspective to national park visitation, it suggests that as members of ethnic minority groups acquire cultural characteristics of the dominant culture, or affiliate with majority group members, they will exhibit national park visitation patterns similar to those of the majority.

Assimilation theory has been faulted for its association with "ethnocentric and patronizing" viewpoints (Alba and Nee 1997). In the past, researchers and policy

makers assumed that assimilation was inevitable and desirable. Many believed that the socioeconomic standing of ethnic minorities would improve once ethnic cultural traits were discarded in favor of U.S. mainstream values. Over time, ethnic minorities were expected to gradually lose their ethnic distinctiveness and blend with other ethnic groups in the American "melting pot," or were expected to lose their distinctiveness by conforming to Anglo American standards (Yetman 1985).

Apart from its association with prejudicial viewpoints, assimilation continues to be a relevant and important concept for understanding ethnic influences on many behavioral outcomes, including recreation participation. Re-thinking some of the implications of this perspective has given rise to concepts such as selective acculturation and segmented assimilation. **Selective acculturation** refers to the strategic retention of core ethnic values and practices among ethnic minorities (Keefe and Padilla 1987; Gramann et al. 1993). **Segmented assimilation** recognizes that the U.S. is a multicultural and socioeconomically stratified society (i.e., segmented), creating a variety of possible assimilation outcomes (Portes and Zhou 1993; Portes and Rombaut 1996).

The Discrimination Hypothesis

Among academics and park managers, discrimination is often cited as a barrier to greater minority participation in outdoor recreation. It is generally assumed that perceptions of discrimination or actual experiences with discrimination exert a negative affect on visitation among racial and ethnic minorities. In contrast to the marginality hypothesis, the discrimination hypothesis directs attention to contemporary (rather than historical) sources of discrimination arising from interpersonal interaction with other visitor groups or management personnel. Unfortunately, significant theoretical or empirical work on this hypothesis has yet to be conducted. In the few studies that attempt to offer insight to the relationship between minority recreation use patterns and discrimination, either substantial empirical evidence, or a comprehensive analysis of the process by which discrimination impacts visitation, is lacking. For example, Floyd, Gramann, and Saenz (1993) hypothesized that perceived discrimination would negatively affect use of public outdoor recreation areas among Hispanic Americans in the Phoenix, Arizona metropolitan area. They observed that as perceived discrimination increased, use of the parks decreased; however, this pattern was not significant in statistical terms.

Understanding the effect of discrimination on minority use patterns requires the identification of types and range of discrimination in recreation settings (Floyd 1998a). For example, most studies focus on perceived discrimination at the individual or interpersonal level. Institutional discrimination, or discriminatory practices embedded in the structures of societal institutions (e.g., agency culture), has been largely neglected by researchers. In addition, behavioral responses to discrimination (such as choosing alternative sites, non-participation in activities, or modifying social groups) have not been the subject of research. Intuitively, experiences with discrimination may be linked to low rates of park visitation. Gramann (1996) has suggested that minorities may exhibit avoidance or displacement behaviors and seek alternative sites for their recreation as a result of discrimination. How discrimination occurs and how it ultimately affects choices about activities and sites for recreation is not clear.

Research on Minority Use of National Parks

This section provides a selective overview of empirical studies of minority use of national parks and related activities. It is organized around four types of studies: (1) national, regional, and statewide surveys, (2) studies specific to NPS units, (3) studies related to on-site use of non-NPS units that focus on style of park use, and (4) studies involving urban parks. Studies that address theoretical issues mentioned in the previous section will be noted. Since time periods, scope, populations, methods of analysis, and theoretical perspectives vary, meaningful comparisons across studies is difficult. Thus, any generalizations must be made with caution. However, general trends in the literature can be identified and are summarized at the end of this section.

Findings from National, State, and Regional Studies

Several national and regional studies have addressed some aspect of minority use of parks or related activity. The earliest research from the 1960s and 1970s mostly report African American/White comparisons, while studies from the 1980s and 1990s include other racial and ethnic groups. Results from national survey studies are presented first, followed by results from state and regional studies.

National Survey Findings

According to the 1982-1983 National Recreation Survey, 42% of White respondents reported having never visited a national park, compared to 83% of non-White minorities (Gramann 1996). Among respondents who reported park visits, Whites averaged three trips to national parks sometime in the past, while the average number of trips to national parks among non-Whites was less than one—0.33 (Hartmann and Overdevest 1990). The survey also indicated that Whites' level of participation (average number of days per year) in outdoor recreation activities was nearly twice the rate of non-Whites (40 vs. 21 days). Smaller differences were observed for the average number of activities engaged in annually (8 activities for Whites, vs. 5 activities for non-Whites) and the proportion willing to spend over \$20 for an annual park pass (70% for Whites, vs. 69% for non-Whites). It should be noted that these results were reported without controlling for socioeconomic background. Also, it was not possible to disaggregate the non-White portion of the sample to determine what specific racial or ethnic groups were represented.

Market Opinion Research (1986) conducted a national survey of outdoor recreation for the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. This study reported frequency of use of "federal parks, forests, and recreation areas" for Whites, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and "other" racial groups (i.e., Asian Americans and Native Americans). The response categories for the questionnaire items measuring frequency of park use were "very often," "often," "sometimes," and "never." Data were only reported for the "very often" and "often" categories. Members of the "other" category reported the highest frequency of use, 21% reporting "very often" or "often." Hispanic Americans exhibited the lowest frequency of use at 8%. Among Whites, 19% reported "very often" or "often"; among African Americans, 13% indicated "very often" or "often." Regarding frequency of participation in NPS-relevant activities, large differences among these groups (greater than 10%) were not observed for wildland activities (e.g., camping, backpacking, day hiking) or visiting historic sites.

Based on data from the 1985-87 Public Area Recreation Visitor Study, Hartmann and Overdevest (1990) reported that over 94% of visitors to five federal recreation areas nationwide (U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tennessee Valley Authority, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration sites) and 11 state agencies were White; 2.2% were Hispanic American; and 2% were African American. They also found considerable variation in activities relevant to NPS sites. Participation was defined as an activity engaged in at least once during the survey year. African Americans exhibited the lowest rate of participation in backpacking, camping both in developed and primitive areas, wildlife observation and photography, canoeing and kayaking, and downhill skiing. Native Americans, African Americans, and Hispanic Americans exhibited the lowest participation in evening campfire programs compared to Whites and Asian Americans. There was more similarity than difference across racial and ethnic categories for visiting a museum or information center, reading roadside exhibits or markers, driving for pleasure, sightseeing, picnicking, and general photography.

Variations in travel patterns by race and ethnicity were also found. Hartmann and Overdevest (1990) found that African Americans reported the lowest median travel distance (one-way) of 50 miles. Asian Americans reported traveling the greatest distance with a median of 90 miles. The median travel distance for Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, Whites, and "other" groups was nearly identical. Travel destinations are closely related to place of residence. The region of residence for survey respondents was not reported by the authors, however. Based on average length of stay, African Americans appeared least likely to stay overnight, with an average length of stay of 4 hours. Whites reported the longest length of stay, with an average of 18 hours. In the middle range of length of stay, Hispanic Americans reported 9 hours, and Native Americans and Asian Americans reported 8 and 6 hours respectively.

Based on data collected by Longwoods Research Group Ltd. for the U.S. Pleasure Travel Market Study, Dwyer (1994) reported variation in park use by race and ethnicity. The survey sample included responses for 14,787 Whites, 2,024 African Americans, 1,184 Hispanic Americans, and 455 respondents from "other"

racial groups. Dwyer reported that African Americans had the lowest rate of visiting national or state parks (24%) compared to Whites (45.4%), Hispanic Americans (37.7%), and "other" racial groups (48.7%). Regarding activity participation, Dwyer noted that the most distinct pattern when observing racial and ethnic differences was the consistency with which African Americans were less likely to participate in many outdoor recreation activities, including wildland and water-based activities. Whites and Hispanic Americans were more similar in their patterns of participation.

A number of other national studies contain results that are relevant to the NPS. One of the earliest studies to examine racial differences in outdoor recreation was conducted for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission by Mueller and Gurin (1962). It stands as the only major study of the pre-civil rights era (i.e., prior to 1964) to examine minority involvement in outdoor recreation. Mueller and Gurin (1962) found that, in general, African Americans engaged in outdoor recreation activities "infrequently" compared to Whites. African American infrequent participation was attributed to their lower socioeconomic status compared to Whites. Interestingly, differences in the participation rates between African Americans and Whites persisted when statistical controls for socioeconomic status were introduced, leading Mueller and Gurin to suggest that race bears a significant relationship to activity participation, independent of socioeconomic status differences between African Americans and Whites. Their findings were instrumental in the development of the marginality and subcultural hypotheses.

The 1977 Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS) national survey also documented differences between Whites and African Americans (O'Leary and Benjamin 1981). Using data from a telephone survey of 4,029 U.S. households, comparisons were made of the percentage of African Americans and Whites participating in selected activities. Few differences by race were observed for "high participation" activities (i.e., those with at least 40% of respondents participating). These included fishing, swimming, walking to observe nature, walking for pleasure, bicycling, picnicking, outdoor sports, sightseeing, driving for pleasure, visiting amusement parks, and attending sporting events. For 9 of 11 of these activities, no difference was greater than 10%. The largest differences, and where

Whites participated in greater percentages than African Americans, were observed for outdoor swimming (Whites, 52% vs. African Americans, 28%) and sightseeing (Whites, 69% vs. African Americans, 48%). Overall, there was at least a 10% difference between White and African American rates of participation in developed camping, primitive camping, outdoor swimming, hiking or backpacking, hunting, sledding, golf, and driving for pleasure. The rate of participation for African Americans was greater than Whites on one activity—participation in outdoor plays and dances (Whites, 43% vs. African Americans, 56%).

Also using the 1977 HCRS survey data, Washburne and Wall (1980) conducted an analysis that compared Whites and African Americans on several outdoor activities. Before introducing statistical controls for socioeconomic differences between the groups, the researchers found significant differences between Whites and African Americans in developed and primitive camping, boating, hiking/backpacking, and sightseeing. After controls, differences in rates of participation remained, or were only negligibly reduced, providing evidence of subcultural influences.

Questions pertaining to use of national parks were not asked in the most recent national survey on outdoor recreation, the 1994-1995 National Survey of Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) (Outdoor Recreation Coalition of America 1996). The survey does, however, permit comparisons of recreation activities by racial and ethnic group. Participation was measured as engaging in an activity at least once during the last year. There was a considerable degree of similarity in the participation rates of Whites, African Americans, and "other" groups (which included Hispanic Americans) in visiting nature centers, using a visitor center, visiting historic or prehistoric sites, birdwatching, sightseeing, and fishing. Larger differences (greater than 10%) were observed for developed and primitive camping, swimming in outdoor settings, hiking, and boating. The prevailing pattern was that the largest differences were observed between Whites and African Americans. Whites and members of the "other" group tended to exhibit similar rates of participation. As with the previously cited studies (e.g., Hartmann and Overdevest 1990), it was not possible to disaggregate the "other" category to identify specific ethnic groups.

The National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wild-

life-Associated Recreation (U.S. Department of the Interior 1996) provides comparisons by race of hunting, fishing, and wildlife-watching. Similar to findings from other national surveys, the percentage of White participants in hunting and fishing was greater than that of African Americans and "other" racial and ethnic groups. Regarding wildlife-watching, an activity common in many national parks, 13% of Whites engaged in nonresidential wildlife-watching (trips of at least one mile from home) compared with 2% of African Americans and 7% of "other" racial and ethnic groups. In the earlier 1991 version of the survey (U.S. Department of the Interior 1991), 18% of Whites engaged in nonresidential wildlife-watching compared to 4% of African Americans and 9% of "other" groups. Thus, the differences between these groups in wildlife-watching have remained consistent over a five-year time period.

In recent years, more consideration has been given to gender differences in recreation participation. Floyd, Shinew, McGuire, and Noe (1994) suggested that gender interacts with race and ethnicity to affect outdoor recreation participation. Based on data from a national survey of leisure preferences of U.S. adults, they found that White males and African American males who considered themselves poor or working class did not differ significantly when compared on their favorite recreation activities. However, White females and African American females who considered themselves poor or working class differed significantly when their favorite leisure activities were compared. Outdoor activities and camping were ranked second and third among White females, and seventh and tenth among African American females. Although this study focused on preferences rather than actual participation, it is important because it demonstrates the possible effects of "doubleminority" status (i.e., being minority and female) on outdoor recreation participation.

Findings from State Surveys

Trends in results from national surveys can also be observed in statewide and regional studies. Overall, statewide studies reveal racial and ethnic variation in activity participation and travel patterns. Although the studies vary in measurement of participation, geographic focus, and population, the results are fairly consistent.

A statewide survey of Indiana residents found that African Americans participated less frequently than Whites in 17 of 28 activities, including several outdoor activities (O'Leary and Benjamin 1981). The study also examined activity involvement, measured by the mean number of participation days. Interestingly, there were 5 activities for which African Americans exhibited higher rates of participation and greater involvement. These included bicycling, car-camping, hiking, nature walking, and fishing. Based on a composite measure of overall recreation involvement, O'Leary and Benjamin (1981) reported that Whites' level of involvement in outdoor recreation was statistically and significantly greater than African Americans'.

Using data from a statewide survey of Illinois residents, Dwyer (1994) compared participation among Whites, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans. In his analysis, the effect of race and ethnicity on participation were observed while controlling for age, residence, household income, gender, and household size. Compared to Whites, African Americans were significantly less likely to participate in rural, wildland, and water-based activities. Hispanic Americans were significantly less likely to engage in downhill skiing, water skiing, motor-boating, and bicycling when controlling for socioeconomic factors. Asian Americans, compared to Whites, differed primarily on sports (e.g., softball and baseball), bicycling, and pool swimming. The results of this analysis lend support to the subcultural hypothesis.

Results from Illinois statewide surveys also show significant variation in travel patterns. Dwyer (1993) found that Whites were more likely to take an overnight trip (in Illinois or outside of Illinois) than African Americans, Hispanic Americans, or Asian Americans. The largest difference in the likelihood of taking an overnight trip was between Whites and African Americans. Similarly, using data from the National Family Opinion Travel Survey, McCreedy and O'Leary (1992; cited in Dwyer 1994), found that African Americans were less likely than Whites, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans to take a summer pleasure trip of 100 miles or more and one or more overnight trips.

A statewide survey of Texas residents on public uses of natural resources (Adams and Thomas 1989) found Whites comprised 70% of participants in "appreciative" outdoor activities such as wildlife-watching, wildlife feeding, photography, wildflower study, hiking, backpacking, and boating, compared to African Americans

(10.3%) and Hispanic Americans (18.4%). For "utilitarian" activities, such as fishing and hunting, only slight differences were found between Whites (41.3%) and Hispanic Americans (39.7%). In contrast, African Americans represented only 19.1% of this activity group.

Results from a more recent statewide survey of Texas residents (Scott and Kim 1998) tend to match these findings, with the exception of fishing participation. This study found that African Americans and Hispanic Americans participate less frequently in fishing, camping, boating, use of trails, and wildlife-watching than White, non-Hispanic residents. Less frequent participation was observed even when income differences between groups were held constant.

Findings from Regional Studies

Regional studies focused on single or multiple metropolitan regions. In contrast to national and statewide studies, studies at the regional level were often guided by a theoretical orientation and designed to specifically address questions of minority recreation participation. Moreover, in these studies, survey respondents were often asked specific questions about national park use. As a group, their findings support the view that subcultural factors account for racial and ethnic differences in national park visitation.

In a study involving Nashville, Tennessee residents, Yancey and Snell (1976) compared park use among lower, working, and middle class Whites and African Americans. While the study did not focus on use of specific parks, it did examine use by type of park. White residents and middle class residents were more likely than African Americans and lower class residents to visit state and national parks. African Americans were more likely than Whites to use local or neighborhood parks. In each social class category, the proportion of African Americans who visited state and national parks was lower than the proportion of Whites. This finding suggested that factors other than social class were related to park use.

One of the most widely cited studies comparing Whites and African Americans is Washburne's (1978) analysis of "Black under-participation" in wildland recreation. Two alternative explanations, the marginality and subcultural hypotheses, were tested in the study. Using data from a 1969 survey of residents of 8 California cities, these hypotheses were tested by comparing

Whites and African Americans on several activities including visiting local parks, visiting regional and remote parks or recreation sites, camping, hiking, and travel. Statistically significant differences between Whites and African Americans were found for each of these activities except for visiting local parks. Significant differences between Whites and African Americans persisted despite controls for sociodemographic factors (i.e., gender, age, education, and income). The results of this test provided evidence that race or ethnicity exert independent effects on park use and other outdoor recreation activities. Thus, Washburne concluded that differences between Whites and African Americans in outdoor recreation participation were attributable to "ethnicity" or subcultural factors rather than "marginality" or socioeconomic factors. However, factors associated with race (i.e., discrimination based on physical characteristics) were not addressed.

Similar conclusions were drawn in one of the few studies to examine Native American use of national parks. Dragon and Ham (1986) compared national park visitation by Native Americans (Nez Perce tribal members) and White residents of Idaho. They concluded that the ethnicity hypothesis was "the most plausible" explanation for low visitation among Native Americans, rather than economic disadvantages. Wildland parks do not appear to fill the same set of cultural needs among Whites and Native Americans (McDonald and McAvoy 1997). Native Americans also differ from Whites in their use of natural resource lands for spiritual rituals and subsistence activities such as fishing and hunting (McDonald and McAvoy 1997).

In a study of Phoenix, Arizona residents which compared White, non-Hispanics and Hispanic Americans, differences in visitation to national parks units were found (Gramann and Floyd 1991). (In this study, the term "Anglo American" was used to identify White, non-Hispanic respondents compared to Hispanic Americans, since Hispanic Americans can also designate "White" as their racial identification. "Mexican Americans" were identified as a subgroup of Hispanic Americans in this study.) White, non-Hispanics were significantly more likely to have visited a national park at least twice during the previous year than were Hispanic Americans. White, non-Hispanics were also more likely to have visited a national forest at least twice in the last year. Regarding visitation to specific NPS sites in the Phoenix

metropolitan area, respondents were asked about visits to Casa Grande Ruins, Montezuma Castle, and the Tonto National Monuments. A higher proportion of White, non-Hispanics was associated with each site. However, only in the case of Montezuma Castle was the difference statistically significant. Furthermore, there were few differences among White, non-Hispanics and Hispanic Americans in participation in 23 selected activities. The largest differences between White, non-Hispanics and Hispanic Americans were sightseeing (75.3% vs. 51.6%), followed by fishing, where a greater proportion of Hispanic Americans (51.6% vs. 37.2%) participated at least twice during the previous year. A greater proportion of Hispanic Americans also participated in tent camping (45.3% vs. 35%). A higher proportion of White, non-Hispanics reported visits to archeological and historic sites (58.5% vs. 42.5%). Further analyses by Floyd and Gramann (1993) provided insight into the nature of this pattern of results.

Floyd and Gramann (1993) examined the effect of assimilation and acculturation on activity participation and use of national forest recreation areas among Hispanic Americans (specifically Mexican Americans) in the Phoenix metropolitan area. While controlling for age and education, Hispanic Americans who were classified as "least acculturated" were found to participate in significantly fewer activities than White, non-Hispanics. This was observed for water and snow-based activities, urban activities, consumptive activities (e.g., camping, fishing, and hunting), and travel-oriented activities (e.g., sightseeing). Hispanic Americans who were classified as "most acculturated" exhibited patterns of participation more similar to White, non-Hispanics. No relationship was found between acculturation and use of specific national forest recreation areas. However, there was a relationship between the extent to which Hispanic Americans interact with other Hispanic Americans in primary relationships (e.g., friendship groups) and in the use of 4 of 7 recreation areas studied. While an individual's cultural orientation is shaped mainly through primary relationships (Floyd and Gramann 1993), acculturation and primary group assimilation appear to have distinct effects on recreation participation. It appears that acculturation may be more important than primary group assimilation in explaining activity participation, whereas primary group assimilation may influence site visitation.

In a recent study of minority use of cultural heritage sites, Falk (1995) examined factors related to museum-going among African Americans. His sample was drawn from 6 urban communities in the eastern U.S. Nearly half of the respondents reported visiting a museum "at least once every few years." The remainder reported never, or virtually never, visiting a museum. Of several sociodemographic variables studied, the type of community in which respondents resided correlated most strongly with museum visits. Middle-income respondents residing in racially-mixed neighborhoods were the most likely to report visiting a museum by themselves or with their children. Income and education were also positively correlated with museum visits among African Americans.

The importance of community or neighborhood in influencing national park visits was shown by Bultena and Field (1980). While race or ethnic patterns were not the focus of their study, they found that the park visitation rate of working-class individuals who lived in middle-class communities was significantly higher than that of working-class individuals residing in predominantly working-class neighborhoods. They also found that the visitation rate for middle-class individuals who lived in a predominantly working class community was lower than that of middle-class members residing in a middle-class community.

Open-ended responses from Falk's (1995) analysis revealed that the two most important reasons for not visiting museums were "no time" and "lack of interest"—reasons that are commonly cited in leisure constraints research (Jackson and Scott in press). A qualitative component of the study also revealed that "absence of a museum-going tradition" was a major contributor to limited museum participation.

Summary of National, State, and Regional Studies

In general, research results from national survey studies are consistent in showing: (1) a higher proportion of Whites visit national parks than of minority groups, and (2) significant racial and ethnic variation exists in participation in NPS-relevant outdoor activities. The statewide and regional study findings are congruent with these results. Regional studies, in particular, lend support to the subcultural explanation of racial and ethnic differences in national park visitation.

A clear pattern from these studies is the prevalence of African American/White differences in rates of participation, location of participation, and activities. In particular, a higher proportion of Whites participate in wildland or nature-based activities than African Americans. Although some studies show that Whites and African Americans do exhibit similarity in rates of participation in some outdoor activities, the trend emerging from the literature is that Whites and African Americans may be more distinct than they are similar in their activity preference and participation. Whites, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans tend to exhibit more similarity in activity participation. Remarkably, the African American/White disparity in outdoor recreation participation has appeared with regularity in research, spanning nearly four decades. Results from comparisons involving Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans are less clear since few studies report disaggregated data captured in an "other" ethnic category. However, the studies involving Hispanic Americans (specifically, Mexican Americans) and assimilation patterns clearly demonstrate the diversity present within ethnic minority groups.

Several caveats emerge with respect to these findings. First, measures of participation across the different studies vary. Some studies ask respondents about park use or activity participation "at least once during last year" (e.g., the 1996 NSRE) or "at least twice in the previous year" (Gramann and Floyd 1991). Second, in studies of activity participation, measures of participation based on activity groupings comprised of several seemingly related activities, may obscure potential differences associated with single activities. For example, an activity group labeled as "water-based" could mask variation associated with the distinctiveness of motorboating, sailing, or use of personal watercraft. Third, with regard to travel patterns, travel destinations are closely related to place of residence. Most studies do not consider that racial and ethnic groups tend to be concentrated in different regions of the country and may have differential access to parks and outdoor recreation opportunities. [Dwyer's (1994) analysis of the U.S. Pleasure Travel Market Study is one exception.] Finally, several studies that report racial and ethnic differences in park use and activity participation do so without taking into account known socioeconomic status differences between racial and ethnic groups. On average,

African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans lag behind Whites on most socioeconomic status indicators (e.g., income, education, and/or occupational prestige). In studies where socioeconomic status differences are not controlled, it is possible that the effects of income or education on park use or activity participation are being reported, rather than effects associated with race or ethnicity.

Findings Specific to NPS Units

Park-specific studies having a race or ethnicity component are rare in the published and unpublished literature (e.g., unpublished data and technical reports). Snow's (1989) study of Biscayne National Park visitors is one of a few studies that focus on ethnic patterns. The study was undertaken in part to understand Hispanic American use patterns associated with the large Cuban American population in South Florida. The study consisted primarily of Hispanic and non-Hispanic comparisons. The on-site analysis showed no significant variation by ethnicity (i.e., Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic) in the size and composition of travel parties, unlike other studies of Hispanic American groups (e.g., Irwin et al. 1990). There was significant variation by ethnicity on reported problems encountered during the visit, management preferences, and on-site activity preferences. For example, more than 60% of Hispanic American respondents reported problems involving "poor fishing," "crowding in campgrounds," "dirty restrooms and showers," "not enough information on park rules and regulations," and "not enough information on the area's natural environment." Significance tests were not reported for these results. Hispanic American visitors also reported being satisfied with current levels and degree of services and programs, but were more likely to desire more services and facilities (e.g., particularly places for food and fuel, reef tours, information signs, ranger patrols, campsites, anchorage areas, ranger-led activities, visitor centers, developed picnic areas, clean restrooms, exhibits, navigational aids, snorkel areas, and places to view wildlife).

Regarding on-site recreational preferences, Snow (1989) found that Hispanic American visitors (compared to White, non-Hispanic visitors) were more likely to engage in picnicking, swimming, beach combing, and ranger-led activities. These differences were statistically significant. They are comparable to findings from the

Irwin et al. (1990) study of a national forest campground in New Mexico. In this study, Hispanic American (specifically, Mexican American) campers rated the importance of "tangible" site features such as toilets, camping space at each site, availability of water, and fire rings higher than "intangibles" such as privacy and quiet. Privacy and quiet were rated highest by White, non-Hispanic campers.

In a study of visitor perceptions at Petersburg National Battlefield, Floyd (1986) found that African American visitors were more likely to view the battlefield grounds as a site to serve the recreational needs of the local community. Whereas Whites were more likely to perceive the area in terms of its historical significance. This finding is largely explained by the higher proportion of African Americans who were local residents. The Battlefield is located near residential areas in a city with a majority African American population.

Kornblum's (1983) study of Jacob Riis Park Beach is unique in its use of ethnography as the primary methodological tool. Incorporated into Gateway National Recreation Area in 1975, Riis Park Beach attracts a highly diverse user population. Whites, African Americans, West Indian Blacks, Asian Americans, Central and South Americans, and, more recently, White ethnic immigrants (e.g., Russian and Polish immigrants) commonly frequent the area (Kornblum 1983; Fisher et al. 1995). Kornblum examined the process by which different racial and ethnic groups spatially separate themselves along the beach. He noted that ethnicity, lifestyle preferences, and age were key factors in this process. In general, there was separation by lifestyle preferences (i.e., sexual orientation), race (African American/White separation) and ethnicity (i.e., separation among Latinos and West Indians), and age, in which young White adults formed a spatially separate group. Kornblum concluded that this pattern was not unique to Riis Park Beach, but is common to most urban parks in similar ethnic and cultural milieus.

The Visitor Services Project (VSP), at the University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit, has included a question about visitor ethnicity in a selected number of its visitor studies. Findings from these studies show similar visitation patterns as described in other research. In VSP studies, data were not collected on the ethnicity of each visitor, but as ethnicities represented within the visitor groups. Survey respondents could check more

than one category, reflecting multi-ethnic visitor groups. Results from these surveys are summarized below:

- In the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, 95% of the visitor groups included Whites, 8% included Hispanic Americans, 4% included African Americans, and 10% included "other" minority groups (Littlejohn 1993a).
- At Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site, 94% of the visitor groups included Whites, 5% included Hispanic Americans, 7% included "other" minority groups, and no African American visitation was recorded (Littlejohn 1993b).
- At Whitman Mission National Historic Site, 93% of the visitor groups included Whites, 1% included Hispanic Americans, 7% included "other" minority groups, and no African American visitation was recorded (Madison 1994).
- At Booker T. Washington National Monument, 85% of the visitor groups included Whites, 17% included African Americans, 4% included Hispanic Americans, and 4% included "other" minority groups (Patterson 1996a).
- At Bandelier National Monument, 90% of the visitor groups included Whites, 8% included Hispanic Americans, 2% included American Indian/Native Alaskan, 1% included African Americans, and 5% included "other" minority groups (Patterson 1996b).

Findings Related to Style of Park Use

Several studies have examined ethnic differences in *style* of on-site recreational use. Style refers to "the unique quality of recreation behavior that arises from variations in group size, group composition, participation motives, preferred activities, and attitudes towards natural and cultural resources" (Gramann et al. 1992:167). Due to the large presence of Hispanic American groups at outdoor recreation areas in the West and Southwest, style differences rather than "under-participation" have become an important focus of research. As suggested by Snow's (1989) study, style differences are likely to have direct implications for NPS visitor and site management.

A number of studies have documented ethnic differences in on-site behavior and style of use. Irwin et al. (1990) found that Hispanic Americans camped in groups almost twice as large as White, non-Hispanics. Hispanic American camping parties averaged 12.8 people, while the White, non-Hispanic average was 6.9. Gramann (1996) reported that among visitors to Yosemite National Park the mean party size for White, non-Hispanics was 3.1, while the mean for Hispanic American park visitors was 4.4.

Large group sizes among Hispanic American visitors reflect differences in the social composition of recreation groups (Gramann 1996). For example, in the Irwin et al. (1990) study, Hispanic American camping parties, on average, included more adults (7.6 vs. 4.7) and children (5.2 vs. 2.2) than White, non-Hispanic parties. In a study set in the Angeles National Forest, Carr and Williams (1993) reported that about 51% of Hispanic American parties were part of extended families, compared to 30% of White, non-Hispanic parties. They also observed patterns of acculturation in social group composition. Second generation Hispanic Americans (specifically Mexican Americans) were more likely to visit recreation areas on the Angeles National Forest as friendship groups, as were White, non-Hispanics, than immigrant and first generation Hispanic Americans (specifically Mexican Americans).

Similar findings have resulted from on-site studies of urban parks. In studies of Chicago park users, Hutchison and Fidel (1984) and Hutchison (1987) found larger group sizes among Hispanic American park users relative to White, non-Hispanics. Moreover, Hispanic American user groups exhibited variety in social composition, including extended and multiple families. White, non-Hispanic park users, as well as African American users, were more likely to be composed of individuals or peer groups.

In their study of visitors at Mecca Hills, California, managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Bass, Ewert and Chavez (1993) found that Mexican- and U.S.-born Hispanic Americans differed from White, non-Hispanics in several respects. Compared to White, non-Hispanics, Hispanic Americans' on-site behavior was more oriented toward group sports. Hispanic Americans placed more importance on developed site attributes and were more likely to use informal information channels (e.g., word of mouth) to obtain information about the recreation area. They also found that U.S.-born Hispanic Americans were more like their Mexican-born counterparts than U.S.-born White, non-

Hispanics in terms of on-site activity participation and perceived importance of various site attributes.

Motivations for, and benefits sought from, recreation participation are also indicators of style of use. As social group size is a function of group composition, these two factors in turn reflect the importance of social motives and benefits associated with outdoor recreation activities. Given the central importance of the nuclear and extended family in Hispanic culture (Marín and Marín 1991; Sena-Rivera 1979), it is not surprising that social motives and benefits are strongly emphasized among Hispanic American recreationists.

For example, Gramann and Floyd (1991) found that Hispanic Americans (specifically, Mexican Americans) rated "doing something with your family" and "doing something with children" significantly higher as motives for their favorite outdoor activities than White, non-Hispanics. Similar findings were reported by Simcox and Pfister (1990) who found that being with family was a strong motive among Hispanic Americans for use of recreation areas in the Angeles National Forest. They also reported that the "most appealing aspect" of the forest visit among Hispanic Americans was being with family. Bass et al. (1993) also found that Hispanic Americans (both U.S.- and Mexican-born) evaluated family significantly higher as an important aspect of their experience. Likewise, Shaull and Gramann (1998) found that family-related benefits were perceived as more important to Hispanic Americans than to White, non-Hispanics.

Interestingly, researchers are beginning to investigate whether or not the centrality of family among Hispanic American visitors and its effect on motives and benefits erodes with increasing acculturation. Specifically, these studies employed the concept of selective acculturation to explore this issue. In a study of the effect of acculturation on the perceived benefits of outdoor recreation, Gramann, Floyd and Saenz (1993) found that Hispanic Americans (specifically Mexican Americans) rated family-related benefits higher than White, non-Hispanics. The most acculturated Hispanic Americans attached more importance to family-related benefits than White, non-Hispanics and less acculturated Hispanic Americans.

This finding is of interest because it runs counter to assimilation theory. According to the conventional assimilation hypothesis, the least acculturated Hispanic Americans would be expected to attach greater importance to family-related benefits since family interaction is such a core cultural value. Gramann et al. (1993) suggest that certain core values (e.g., importance of family) among Hispanic Americans are less subject to assimilation pressures. Shaull and Gramann's (1998) study provided partial support for this idea. Their study revealed similarity in ratings of family-related benefits between White, non-Hispanics and Hispanic Americans who were described as "most acculturated" and "least-acculturated." Hispanic Americans described as "bicultural" (due to English and Spanish language proficiency) placed more importance on family-related benefits.

These studies suggest that recreation experiences among ethnic minorities can reflect patterns of acculturation and selective acculturation, the strategic retention of core cultural values and practices. They also support the view that assimilation and acculturation do not necessarily lead to conformity to the dominant culture. Selective acculturation also appears to explain leisure preferences among other immigrant groups. For example, in their study of leisure among elderly Chinese, Allison and Geiger (1993) observed that while many western activities were learned, traditional forms of leisure were retained and practiced.

There is some evidence to suggest that African Americans and Whites differ on style variables. Dwyer and Hutchison (1990) found that Whites and African Americans differed significantly on reasons for outdoor recreation participation and preferences for site development. African Americans were more strongly oriented toward social interaction (i.e., meeting new people) and strongly preferred "developed facilities and conveniences." Whites emphasized "getting away" and exhibited stronger preferences for natural areas.

Toth and Brown (1997) found considerable similarity in the motives for fishing among Whites and African Americans in rural Mississippi. They noted, however, that a major point of divergence between the two groups was the importance of subsistence as a fishing motive among African Americans, and the importance of sport aspects of fishing among Whites.

Findings from Urban Regional Parks

Research results from urban parks and similar recreation resources do not vary a great deal from results from national and regional studies. In general, African Americans are less likely than Whites to use urban regional parks. Studies of NPS-relevant activities involving other ethnic minority groups are rare. Although the evidence is limited, discrimination appears to be play a role in urban park use.

West (1989) found that African Americans in Detroit were significantly more likely than Whites to use Detroit city parks (75% vs. 48%) and significantly less likely than Whites to visit regional parks (37.3% vs. 55.9%). He concluded that differences in regional participation can be attributed to a lack of transportation among African Americans. Also prominent among factors related to limited use of regional parks by African Americans was interracial tension. African Americans were significantly more likely than Whites to indicate experiencing some type of racial conflict in regional parks.

In a study of Chicago's Lincoln Park, Gobster and Delgado (1993:78) reported that discrimination "has affected 1 in 10 minority users." African Americans, followed by Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans, were more likely to report a discrimination event. These events included verbal harassment, physical gestures, assaults, nonverbal messages, and harassment from law enforcement officers. Focus group research involving Chicago area residents by Blahna and Black (1993) suggests that racism resulting from on-site and off-site experiences may be an important barrier to use of outdoor recreation settings among urban African Americans and Hispanic Americans.

In a survey of Cleveland area residents, Scott and Munson (1994) found that African Americans were more likely than Whites to be infrequent or non-users of regional parks. Access to transportation appeared to be a significant barrier for African Americans. They were more likely than Whites to report that if convenient public transportation was available, they would visit the parks more frequently. Scott, Wang, and Munson (1993) found that African Americans were "under-represented" and Whites were "over-represented" as visitors to the Cleveland Metroparks Zoo RainForest exhibit. Whites comprised 92.4% of the user population, while comprising 72.6% of the Cuyahoga County population. African Americans were 5.1% of the visitor population, while comprising nearly 25% of the county population. Explanations for the patterns of visitation were

not offered by the authors.

Triana (1994) examined patterns of use among Whites and African Americans to the August Busch Memorial Wildlife Area near St. Louis, Missouri, an area managed by the Missouri Department of Conservation. Approximately 95% of visitors sampled were White; 3.6% were African American. In general, Whites and African Americans were found to prefer different types of on-site activities. The study also compared the percentage of African Americans participating in selected activities to the overall percentage of African Americans visiting the Busch Wildlife Area. African American visitors participated, at greater than expected levels, in fishing, interpretive events, school trips, rabbit hunting, and nature walking. No significant differences were reported for target shooting, nature photography, and social gathering. Consistent with other research, the study found that African Americans who resided nearby (versus those with more distant residences) were most likely to use the area.

In a separate study involving focus groups with African American residents of St. Louis, Wallace and Witter (1992) reported that these residents did not camp because they felt unsafe from racial intimidation. The study also suggested that African Americans would visit an urban nature center only if their safety was secured, and if they were made to feel welcome by the staff.

In summary, research on racial and ethnic differences in style of park use indicates that Hispanic Americans differ from White, non-Hispanics and African Americans in social group size, social group composition, and preference for site attributes. In general, Hispanic Americans visit parks and other outdoor recreation areas as part of larger groups such as extended or multiple family units. The literature also indicates Hispanic American outdoor recreation participation is more socially motivated than White, non-Hispanic recreation. This was attributed to the central importance of nuclear and extended family in Hispanic American culture. It was shown that this cultural value, expressed in recreation style, reflected patterns of acculturation and selective acculturation. Regarding site attributes, there was greater desire for developed facilities among Hispanic Americans than among White, non-Hispanics.

Differences between Whites and African Americans were also noted. There is evidence to suggest that social motives also drive African American participation more than White participation. In one case involving fishing, it was shown that subsistence motives were more important among African Americans than White. Like Hispanic American recreationists, African Americans more than Whites tend to prefer developed setting attributes.

Use of urban regional parks also varies by race. In general, a higher proportion of African Americans use city or local parks than regional parks near their place of residence. A higher proportion of Whites use regional parks. Differential access to car ownership and public transportation were suggested as possible reasons for these findings. Perceived or actual discrimination also appeared to be a significant factor in the use of urban region parks.

Overall Summary of Major Findings

Although the literature on minority use of parks and other recreation areas is diverse, it clearly and consistently shows that different racial and ethnic groups exhibit differing rates of national park visitation, different rates of recreation activity participation, variety in style of on-site use, and different patterns of use with regard to urban parks. Because this literature is so diverse, these trends become more noteworthy. The major findings from the literature are summarized by the following points:

- As documented by national, state, and regional studies, a higher proportion of Whites visit national parks than members of racial and ethnic minority groups.
- These studies also show racial and ethnic differences in participation in outdoor recreation activities. A larger proportion of Whites than minorities participate in wildland or primitive types of recreation. More similarity among racial and ethnic groups was observed for other activities.
- In general, greater differences in activity participation were observed between Whites and African Americans than between White, non-Hispanics and Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans. White, non-Hispanics, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans appeared to be more similar in activity participation.
- Studies at the state and regional level that con-

- trolled for socioeconomic differences between racial and ethnic groups provide empirical evidence of subcultural influences on minority participation.
- Racial and ethnic differences were also found in use of urban parks. In the studies reviewed, access to transportation and experiences with discrimination were identified as factors impacting minority use.
- In general, Hispanic Americans and African American visitors placed greater emphasis on developed facilities and services in outdoor recreation areas compared to White, non-Hispanics.
- Generally, Hispanic American visitors, compared to White, non-Hispanics, were found to participate in larger group sizes, have greater representation of nuclear and extended families, and place greater emphasis on social benefits of outdoor recreation.

The challenge for future research is to understand why these trends exist. With an increased understanding of the nature of these trends, managers and policymakers will be better equipped to formulate appropriate and effective responses.

Review of Research Methods

In this section, the methods of research employed in studies of minority recreation participation are reviewed. Emphasis is placed on the potential of each approach to enhance the design of studies focused on racial and ethnic minority use of national parks.

Most of the research on minority visitation and activity participation has been restricted to population survey research. In several national, state, and regional studies, the telephone survey has served as the primary method of data collection (e.g., the 1982-1983 Nationwide Recreation Survey; 1991 and 1996 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation; 1996 National Survey on Recreation and the Environment; Scott and Kim 1998; Gramann and Floyd 1991; West 1989). In recent years, the national surveys on fishing, hunting and wildlife-associated recreation have used face-to-face interviews to reach respondents who could not be reached by phone.

National, state, and regional surveys have a number of advantages over on-site visitor surveys and other methods. These surveys can be designed to identify subgroups of park users and non-users and their distribution in a population. This capability is of critical importance in specifying rates of park use by different racial and ethnic subgroups. Identifying subgroups of non-users would also be important for identifying former users who may be displaced from a site or users who avoid recreation areas because of potential problems relating to their racial and ethnic background. Additionally, the characteristics of national and regional survey respondents can be checked for representativeness against population characteristics recorded by census surveys. National and regional surveys conducted on a periodic basis (e.g., National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation) and using standardized research protocols also permit longitudinal studies necessary for documenting trends in use patterns.

A serious challenge associated with social survey sampling when studying minority populations is achieving adequate response to survey requests (Jackson et al. 1982). Minorities who live in inner-city areas are generally regarded as "hard-to-reach" survey populations with characteristically low response rates to social surveys (Pottick and Lerman 1991). Language and other cultural barriers also present serious challenges when target populations include minorities whose first language is not English.

On-site visitor surveys, by design, exclude non-users. They are important, however, in providing research information on site-related issues (e.g., service quality, site conditions). The on-site visitor survey has been the primary data-gathering tool for studies focusing on style of park use, including social group size, composition, and management preferences. Respondent experiences in other recreation settings off-site can also be ascertained.

Using secondary data is also a common methodological approach. A number of papers cited in this review have relied on secondary data (e.g., Washburne 1978; Dwyer 1994; Washburne and Wall 1980; Floyd et al. 1994). Critical limitations of using secondary data are that the data do not always fit the research problem at hand, and problems with accuracy of measurement arise from known or unknown errors in the original study (Churchill 1991). A serious limitation associated with using secondary data sources in race and ethnic studies is that race and ethnicity measures are seldom consistent across studies. Moreover, as mentioned earlier,

it is common for researchers to inappropriately rely on racial categories (such as, "White," "Black," and "other") as indicators of ethnicity.

Alternatives to survey methods include qualitative approaches such as in-depth interviewing, ethnographic methods, and focus groups. The use of such methods have been recommended by researchers concerned about the inability of standard survey methods to provide depth of insight into the meaning of leisure in ethnic minority communities (Allison 1988; Henderson 1998). Moreover, Marín and Marín (1991) suggest that Hispanic Americans are more likely to respond to research methods that enhance personal contact rather than impersonal methods, such as surveys. According to these researchers, this tendency stems from cultural values among Hispanic Americans that emphasize preferences for warm, intimate, and respectful interpersonal relationships. McDonald and McAvoy (1997) noted that studies successfully executed in Native American communities have used face-to-face, semi-structured interviews.

Ethnographic research differs from traditional survey research methods by placing the researcher inside the community being studied (Churchill 1991). In this position, the researcher is able to observe daily patterns and routines of the community or setting under investigation. Kornblum's (1983) work in Riis Park Beach of Gateway National Recreation Area is an example of ethnographic research that examines recreational-use patterns among minority groups. This approach holds potential for increased understanding of the subjective meaning of parks from the viewpoint of a particular race or ethnic group.

Focus groups provide another means for gaining insight into minority use and perceptions of national parks. A focus group consists of a small number of individuals brought together to discuss a topic of interest to the researcher. Commonly used in marketing studies, focus groups are now being employed by recreation agencies to gain input from minority communities. Social scientists with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station have experienced success in using focus groups to provide insight into African American and Native American perception and use of Corps recreation facilities (Dunn 1998; Dunn and Feather 1998). Wicks and Norman (1996) used focus groups composed of African Americans to elicit opin-

ions on how to improve the design of telephone and mail surveys directed to their community. In general, findings from focus groups can generate questions for future research, provide immediate feedback on managerial performance and user needs, and provide a forum for gaining input on study designs (e.g., Wicks and Norman 1996).

Systematic observations represent another alternative method used to study minority use of parks. This method provides a relatively unobtrusive means of studying minority use patterns. It is well suited for studying urban parks, and other settings which exhibit the greatest use by minority user groups. Hutchison and Fidel (1984) and Hutchison (1987) have shown that observational strategies are useful in documenting use patterns and social group size and composition among minority park users.

To better understand minority use of national parks, it is necessary to utilize multiple methodological approaches. Carefully designed national or regional surveys will be effective in providing data on issues related to use and non-use of parks at the population level. On-site surveys and observational techniques permit the documentation of behavioral patterns and preferences among minority park users at specific sites. Indepth interviews and ethnographic methods within minority communities can help determine answers to questions concerning the meaning and subjective values associated with national parks. Models for combining and using multiple research paradigms and methodologies are further described by Creswell (1994).

Research Needs

Although differences in outdoor recreation participation by racial and ethnic groups have been studied for many years, there is a lack of social science literature on minority use of national parks. This review was able to draw upon studies from a diversity of published and unpublished sources to examine minority use of parks and other recreation areas and activity participation by different ethnic groups. However, studies designed to address research questions specific to national parks are sorely needed. Research needs emerging from this review are outlined below.

First, while the literature is consistent in showing that racial and ethnic minorities are less likely to visit national parks and use them less frequently than Whites, reasons for non-use and low participation are not clearly understood. Research has suggested that socioeconomic factors, cultural background, and discrimination impact minority use of national parks and other recreation areas. Improved models that incorporate these and other related factors are needed to conceptualize and explain minority use of national parks.

In particular, the role of discrimination in minority decisions regarding park use has not received adequate research attention. In the few studies that have addressed the issue, perceived discrimination was the focus of investigation. More efforts are needed to document the extent of perceived and actual discriminatory behaviors associated with national park settings. Research should also seek to determine if, and to what extent, institutional discrimination exists. Many national parks commemorate events or possess themes that may hold little relevance to minority visitors. In addition, the staff at many parks are overwhelmingly non-minority, and possibly have some effect on visitation patterns among minority groups (Goldsmith 1994). Ultimately, the behavioral consequences of discrimination factors represent an important research need. As mentioned earlier, Gramann (1996) suggests that avoidance and displacement, concepts used mostly in crowding research, may be important variables in understanding the behavioral consequences of discrimination.

Also needed is research that provides baseline information on perceptions held by minority groups toward national parks. Such studies might focus on general issues such as attitudes toward natural and cultural resources and disposition toward recreational use of such resources among racial and ethnic minorities. Studies might also focus on specific issues, such as attitudes and behavioral disposition toward *specific* parks, park resources, facilities, or programs.

Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans are the two fastest growing population segments in the U.S. and are largely concentrated in two geographic regions, the Southwest and Pacific coast regions. There are very little data on hand from national surveys or surveys from these specific regions to describe the visitation patterns and recreation preferences of these two groups. As noted, it is quite common in national and regional studies to find Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans lumped together in an "other" category. This has been a severe limitation in the literature. Primary data-

gathering efforts can overcome this limitation. In addition, Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans groups possess distinct cultural markers (e.g., linguistic diversity and varied immigration histories) that allow for analyses directed toward understanding relationships between acculturation and national park use patterns. It will also become more important to understand the impact of immigration within these populations since the U.S. immigration is dominated by persons from Asia and Latin America (Murdock 1995).

The visibility (or lack thereof) of Native Americans in the literature on minority use of national parks is a concern among researchers and resource managers (McDonald and McAvoy 1997). Historically, a contentious relationship has existed between the Native American community and the National Park Service and other resource management agencies. Conflicts surrounding subsistence uses and access to sacred sites within parks and protected areas have often been the center of contention. McDonald and McAvoy (1997) cite a lack of understanding of the role of parks and wildlands in Native American culture by resource management agencies as a major barrier to cooperative relationships. Studies focused on enlarging the base of empirical literature on traditional uses, especially spiritual and subsistence uses, and contributions to cultural survival of Native Americans, are a critical need. It should be noted that the National Park Service Applied Ethnography Program is currently undertaking research of this nature. However, findings from many of these studies have not been released for public review due to the sensitivity of issues under investigation (e.g., locations of sacred sites) (M. Crespi, personal communication, September 28, 1998).

Another area of importance, and where no research has been conducted, is communication involving minority groups. Using data from a statewide survey of Texas residents, Floyd (1998b) found that Hispanic Americans and African Americans were significantly less likely than Whites to use print media provided by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, but more likely to view television programs produced by the agency. Bass et al. (1993) also found differences between White, non-Hispanics' and Hispanic Americans' use of information sources. Research is needed to address basic questions such as: What information sources are used by minorities in planning recreational trips? How do

members of minority groups obtain information about national parks? What is the relative effectiveness of different methods of communicating with minority groups, particularly non-users? A related issue was raised by Gramann (1996)—while several studies have documented the effectiveness of park communications in reducing rule violations, it is not known whether "communication-based management" has the same effect across different racial and ethnic groups.

Finally, studies employing "mixed methodologies" hold potential for investigating minority use of national parks. Increasingly, researchers have recognized the limitations of standard social survey methods when studying racial and ethnic minorities. As a result, researchers have become more receptive to alternative methods, such as in-depth interviewing and focus groups. Clearly, such methods also have their limitations. Where resources allow it, a pragmatic strategy would be to combine multiple methods of research. Research studies drawing upon quantitative and qualitative methods are likely to provide a more complete understanding of minority use of national parks.

Conclusion

The increasing diversity within the American population presents both opportunities and challenges for the National Park Service. By broadening its constituency to include a wider segment of the population, the NPS will have an opportunity to develop an appreciation for the variety of recreation preferences and styles associated with different racial and ethnic groups, build new alliances within communities of color, and incorporate themes that reflect the diversity of cultures represented in the population. The major challenge to reaching this ideal is to develop an improved understanding of the factors that affect national park use among racial and ethnic minorities. Regarding this challenge, the specific tasks emerging from this literature review are: (1) development of better conceptual models to explain racial and ethnic variation, (2) documentation of the types and range of discrimination and their impact on national park use, (3) evaluation of perceptions and attitudes toward national parks among racial and ethnic minorities, (4) increased study of Hispanic American, Asian American, and Native American populations, and (5) initiation of research on communication issues as they relate to minority use of national parks.

Notes:

- ¹ The four major journals were: *Journal of Leisure Research, Leisure Sciences, Leisure Studies,* and *Leisure and Society/Loisir et Societe.* These journals were reviewed to determine the number of articles on race or ethnicity as a percentage of total number of articles published.
- ² Museum visits referred to visits to a wide range of institutions including art museums, science centers, natural history museums, historical museums, historic sites, zoos, nature centers, and aquaria.

References

- Adams, C.E. and J.K. Thomas. 1989. *Public Uses of Texas Wildlife and Natural Areas*. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Technical Report. College Station, TX: The Texas A&M University System.
- Alba, R. and V. Nee. 1997. Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review* 31:826-874.
- Allison, M.T. 1988. Breaking boundaries and barriers: Future directions in cross-cultural research. *Leisure Sciences* 10:247-259.
- Allison, M.T. and C.W. Geiger. 1993. Nature of leisure activities among the Chinese-American elderly. *Leisure Sciences* 15:309-319.
- Bass, J.M., A. Ewert, and D.J. Chavez. 1993. Influence of ethnicity on recreation and natural environment use patterns: Managing recreation sites for ethnic and racial diversity. *Environmental Management* 17:523-529.
- Blahna, D.J. and K.S. Black. 1993. Racism: A concern for recreation resource managers? In *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings*, ed. P.H. Gobster, 111-118. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-163. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Bultena, G.L. and D.R. Field. 1980. Structural effects in national park going. *Leisure Sciences* 3:221-240.
- Carr, D.S. and D.R. Williams. 1993. Understanding the role of ethnicity in outdoor recreation experiences. *Journal of Leisure Research* 25:22-38.
- Churchill, Jr., G.A. 1991. *Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations* (5th ed.). Chicago, IL: The Dryden Press.
- Creswell, J.W. 1994. Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dragon, C. and S.H. Ham. 1986. Native American underrepresentation in national parks: Tests of the marginality and ethnicity hypotheses. Unpublished paper presented at the First National Symposium on Social Science in Resource

- Management. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University.
- Dunn, R.A. 1998. African American Recreation at Two Corps of Engineers Projects: A preliminary assessment. Natural Resource Technical Note REC-10. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.
- Dunn, R.A. and T.D. Feather. 1998. *Native American Recreation at Corps Projects: Results of Six Focus Groups*. Natural Resource Technical Note REC-10. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.
- Dwyer, J.F. 1993. Outdoor recreation participation: An update on Blacks, Whites, Hispanics and Asians in Illinois. In *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings*, ed. P.H. Gobster, 119-121. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-163. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Dwyer, J.F. 1994. *Customer Diversity and the Future Demand for Outdoor Recreation*. Gen. Tech. Report RM-252. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- Dwyer, J.F. and R. Hutchison. 1990. Outdoor recreation participation and preferences by black and white Chicago households. In *Social Science and Natural Resource Recreation Management*, ed. J. Vining, 49-67. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Falk, J.H. 1995. Factors influencing African American leisure time utilization of museums. *Journal of Leisure Research* 27:41-60.
- Feagin, J.R. 1989. *Racial and Ethnic Relations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fisher, T., C. Jimenez, S. Scheld, and D. Taplin. 1995. *Ethnographic Needs Assessment: Jamaica Bay/Breezy Point Unit, Gateway National Recreation Area Final Report*. New York, NY: The Graduate Center, City University of New York.
- Floyd, M.F. 1986. *Visitor Images and Use of a National Battlefield: The Petersburg example*. Unpublished M.S. thesis, Clemson University Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, Clemson, SC.
- Floyd, M.F. 1998a. Getting beyond marginality and ethnicity: The challenge for race and ethnic studies in leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research* 30:3-22.
- Floyd, M.F. 1998b. Fishing and hunting participation, media use and youth outdoor recreation preferences. In *Texas Outdoors: A Vision for the Future*, a report to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Austin, TX.
- Floyd, M.F. and J.H. Gramann. 1993. Effects of acculturation and structural assimilation in resource-based recreation:

- The case of Mexican Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research* 25:6-21.
- Floyd, M.F., J.H. Gramann, and R. Saenz, 1993. Ethnic patterns and the use of public outdoor recreation areas: The case of Mexican Americans. *Leisure Sciences* 15:83-98.
- Floyd, M.F., K.J. Shinew, F.A. McGuire, and F.P. Noe. 1994. Race, class, and leisure activity preferences: Marginality and ethnicity revisited. *Journal of Leisure Research* 26:158-173.
- Gobster, P.H. and A. Delgado. 1993. Ethnicity and recreation use in Chicago's Lincoln Park. In Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings, ed. P.H. Gobster, 75-81. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-163. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Goldsmith, J. 1994. Designing for diversity. *National Parks* 68:20-21.
- Gordon, M. 1964. Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gramann, J.H. 1996. Ethnicity, Race, and Outdoor Recreation: A Review of Trends, Policy, and Research. Miscellaneous Paper R-96-1, Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.
- Gramann, J.H., M.F. Floyd, and R. Saenz. 1993. Outdoor recreation and Mexican American ethnicity: A benefits perspective. In *Culture, Conflict, and Communication in the Wildland-urban Interface*, eds. A.W. Ewert, D.J. Chavez, and A.W. Magill, 69-84. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gramann, J.H., M.F. Floyd, and A. Ewert. 1992. Interpretation and Hispanic American ethnicity. In *On Interpretation:*Sociology for Interpreters of Natural and Cultural History, eds. G.E. Machlis and D.R. Field, 161-177. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press.
- Gramann, J.H. and M.F. Floyd. 1991. Ethnic Assimilation and Recreational Use of the Tonto National Forest. Technical Report submitted to the Wildland Recreation and Urban Culture Project, Riverside, CA: USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station.
- Hartmann, L.A. and C. Overdevest. 1990. Race, ethnicity, and outdoor recreation participation: A state-of-the-knowledge review and theoretical perspective. In *Proceedings of the 1989 Southeastern Recreation Research Conference*, Volume 11 (February 15-17, 1989, Asheville, NC), ed. Z. Karen. Athens, GA: Institute for Behavioral Research.
- Henderson, K.A. 1998. Researching diverse populations. *Journal of Leisure Research* 30:157-170.

- Hutchison, R. 1987. Ethnicity and urban recreation: Whites, blacks, and Hispanics in Chicago's public parks. *Journal of Leisure Research* 19:205-222.
- Hutchison, R. and K. Fidel. 1984. Mexican-American recreation activities: A reply to McMillen. *Journal of Leisure Research* 16:344-349.
- Irwin, P.N., W.C. Gartner, and C.C. Phelps. 1990. Mexican-American/Anglo cultural differences as recreation style. *Leisure Sciences* 12:335-348.
- Jackson, E.L. and D. Scott. (In press). Leisure constraints: A survey of past research. In *Leisure Studies at the Millennium*, eds. T. Burton and E.L. Jackson. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Jackson, J.S., B. Tucker, and P. Bowman. 1982. Conceptual and methodological problems in survey research on Black Americans. In *Methodological Problems in Minority Research*, ed. W. Liu, 11-39. Chicago, IL: Pacific/Asian Mental Health Research Center.
- Johnson, C.Y. 1998. A consideration of collective memory in African American attachment to wildland recreation places. *Human Ecology Review* 5:5-15.
- Johnson, C.Y., J.M. Bowker, D.B. English, and D. Worthen. 1998. Wildland recreation in the rural South: An examination of marginality and ethnicity theory. *Journal of Leisure Research* 30:101-120.
- Keefe, S.E. and A.M. Padilla. 1987. *Chicano Ethnicity*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Kelly, J.R. 1987. Freedom to Be: A New Sociology of Leisure. New York, NY: MacMillan Press.
- Kornblum, W. 1983. Racial and cultural groups on the beach. *Ethnic Groups* 5:109-124.
- Littlejohn, M. 1993a. Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, Visitor Study (Spring 1993). Visitor Services Project, Report #55. University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- Littlejohn, M. 1993b. Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site, Visitor Study (Summer 1992). Visitor Services Project, Report #48. University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- Madison, D. 1994. Whitman Mission National Historic Site, Visitor Study (Summer 1993). Visitor Services Project, Report #56. University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- Marín, G. and B. Marín. 1991. *Research with Hispanic Populations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Market Opinion Research. 1986. Participation in Outdoor Recreation Among American Adults and the Motivations which Drive Participation. Report prepared for the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors.
- McCreedy, C.C. and J.T. O'Leary. 1992. *Discriminant Analysis:* NFO data. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources
- McDonald, D. and L. McAvoy. 1997. Native Americans and leisure: State of the research and future directions. *Journal of Leisure Research* 29:145-166.
- Meeker, J.W. 1973. Red, White, and Black in the national parks. In *On Interpretation: Sociology for interpreters of natural resource and cultural history*, eds. G.E. Machlis and D.R. Field, 195-205. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press.
- Mueller, E. and G. Gurin. 1962. Participation in Outdoor Recreation: Factors affecting demand among American adults. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) Study Report 20. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Murdock, S.H. 1995. *An America Challenged: Population change and the future of the United States.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- O'Leary, J.T. and P. Benjamin. 1981. Ethnic Variations in Leisure Behavior: Studies, Theories and Directions for Future Research. Cooperative Research Project. USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, Chicago and Purdue University.
- Outdoor Recreation Coalition of America. 1996. *National Survey on Recreation and the Environment*. Available at: http://outdoorlink.com/infosource/nsre/index.htm
- Patterson, M. 1996a. Booker T. Washington National Monument, Visitor Study (Summer 1995). Visitor ServicesProject, Report #81. University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- Patterson, M. 1996b. Bandelier National Monument, Visitor Study (Summer 1995). Visitor Services Project, Report #76. University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- Portes, A. and R.G. Rumbaut. 1996. *Immigrant America: A Portrait.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. and M. Zhou. 1993. The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74-96.
- Pottick, K.J. and P. Lerman. 1991. Maximizing survey response rates for hard-to-reach inner-city populations. *Social Science Quarterly* 72:172-180.

- Scott, D. and C. Kim. 1998. Outdoor recreation participation and barriers to involvement. In *Texas Outdoors: A Vision for* the Future, A report to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Austin, TX.
- Scott, D. and W. Munson. 1994. Perceived constraints to park usage among individuals with low incomes. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* 12:79-96.
- Scott, D., P. Wang, and W. Munson. 1993. *An Evaluation of The RainForest at Cleveland Metroparks Zoo: A Summary of Findings*. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Metroparks.
- Sena-Rivera, J. 1979. Extended kinship in the United States: Competing models and the case of la familia chicana. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 41:121-129.
- Shaull, S.L. and J.H. Gramann. 1998. The effect of cultural assimilation on the importance of family-related and nature-related recreation among Hispanic Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research* 30:47-63.
- Simcox, D.E. and R.E. Pfister. 1990. Hispanic Values and Behaviors Related to Outdoor Recreation and the Forest Environment. Technical Report submitted to U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Riverside, CA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- Snow, R.E. 1989. Recreation Resource Management and Planning Study for the Biscayne National Park. Final report to the National Park Service, Atlanta, GA: Cooperative Park Studies Unit. Georgia State University.
- Taylor, D.E. 1989. Blacks and the environment: Toward an explanation of the concern and action gap. *Environment and Behavior* 21:175-205.
- Toth, Jr., J.F. and R.B. Brown. 1997. Racial and gender meanings of why people participate in recreational fishing. *Leisure Sciences* 19:129-146.
- Triana, J. 1994. Differences in the Use and Perception of the August A. Busch Memorial Wildlife Area by Blacks and Whites. Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Missouri-Columbia, School of Natural Resources, Columbia, MO.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1994. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1994* (114th ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. 1997. *National Park Service* 1997 Strategic Plan. Washington, DC. Available at: http://www.nps.gov/planning/sp/
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census. 1996. 1996 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-

- Associated Recreation. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census. 1991. 1991 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Washburne, R.F. 1978. Black under-participation in wildland recreation: Alternative explanations. *Leisure Sciences* 1:175-189.
- Washburne, R.F. and P. Wall. 1980. *Black-White Ethnic Differences in Outdoor Recreation*. U.S. Department of Agriculture Research Paper INT-249. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- West, P.C. 1989. Urban region parks and Black minorities: Subculture, marginality, and interracial relations in park use in the Detroit metropolitan area. *Leisure Sciences* 11:11-28.
- Wicks, B.E. and K.A. Norman. 1996. Improving African American survey response rates for leisure marketing and planning studies. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* 14:1-15.
- Wallace, V.K. and D.J. Witter. 1992. Urban nature centers: What do our constituents want and how can we give it to them? *Legacy* 2:20-24.
- Woodard, M.D. 1993. Leisure among African Americans:
 Toward an indigenous frame of reference. In *Managing Urban and High-use Recreation Settings*, ed. P.H. Gobster.
 Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-163. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.
- Yancey, W.L. and J. Snell. 1976. Parks as aspects of leisure in the inner city: An exploratory investigation. In *Research in the Parks—Transactions of the National Park Centennial Symposium*, Annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (28-29 December 1971), ed. Neil Reid, 149-168. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Yetman, N.R. 1985. Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity in American Life (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Yinger, J.M. 1981. Toward a theory of assimilation and dissimilation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4:249-264.

Glossary

acculturation: The first stage of assimilation; minority group acquisition of cultural characteristics of the majority group (such as language, diet, and religion) (Gordon 1964). Also known as *cultural assimilation*.

assimilation: A broad concept referring to the process by which minority groups are integrated into the dominant culture

cultural assimilation The first stage of assimilation; the acquisition of cultural characteristics of the majority group (such as language, diet, and religion) by the minority group (Gordon 1964). Also known as *acculturation*.

ethnicity (or **ethnic group**): A social group set apart on the basis of cultural or nationality characteristics.

marginality: As used in the marginality hypothesis, the result of past sanctioned and unsanctioned discrimination that created barriers to full participation in society's major social and cultural institutions by racial and ethnic minorities. Examples of marginality indicators used in previous research include income, employment status and occupational status, and access to transportation.

minority group: A numerical minority usually referring to African Americans, Hispanic Americans, American Indians or Native Americans, and Asian Americans.

race (or **racial group**): A social group distinguished or set apart, by others or by itself, primarily on the basis of real or perceived physical characteristics.

segmented assimilation: A process of incorporation in, or adaptation, to a multi-cultural and stratified society leading to different assimilation outcomes (such as, conformity to dominant cultural standards, retention of traditional cultural standards, or a blending of traditional and dominant standards).

selective acculturation: Refers to the strategic adoption, among ethnic minorities, of some culture traits of the dominant culture (e.g., learning English), while retaining other traditional core ethnic values and practices.

structural assimilation: The second stage of assimilation; the extent of social interaction between majority and minority groups in primary (i.e., family and friendships) or secondary social groups (i.e., school, work, or residential).

subculture: As used in the subcultural hypothesis, refers to the different norms, value systems, and socialization practices adhered to by racial and ethnic groups within a dominant culture, that can create differences in recreation behaviors independent of socioeconomic factors.

Additional Resources

U.S. Forest Service

North Central Forest Experiment Station

Research Work Unit, Managing Forest Environments for Urban Populations

845 Chicago Avenue, Suite 225

Evanston, IL 60202

Phone: (847) 866-9311, FAX: (847) 866-9506

This unit of the U.S. Forest Service regularly conducts studies that focus on values, perceptions, and use of urban forests and parks among racial and ethnic minorities.

U.S. Forest Service

Pacific Southwest Research Station Wildland Recreation and Urban Cultures Unit 4955 Canyon Crest Drive Riverside, CA 92507

Phone: (909) 680-1557, FAX: (909) 680-1501

The Wildland Recreation and Urban Cultures unit of the U.S. Forest Service has conducted several studies that describe the changing patterns of recreation use associated with the increased presence of Hispanic American recreationists on urban proximate forests in the Pacific Southwest. The unit publishes a research newsletter, *Recreation Update*, that regularly summarizes study results.

Roundtable Associates (RTA), Inc.

1400 16th St. NW, Suite 710

Washington, D.C. 20036

Phone: Washington Office (202) 588-9393, Maryland

Office (301) 622-9208

RTA is a national organization that provides a forum for policy discussions related to recreation, park, and conservation issues. Its primary goal is to foster deliberation and actions that are necessary to ensure that the park, recreation, and conservation profession and its service systems address the issues and concerns of all Americans—African Americans and other ethnic minorities in particular.

About the Author

Myron F. Floyd is an associate professor in the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences at Texas A&M University, College Station. He teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in park and natural resources management. His research focuses on race and ethnicity issues in outdoor recreation and natural resources management. Since 1990, Professor Floyd has studied outdoor recreation behavior among Hispanic Americans, including Mexican Americans in the Southwest and Cuban Americans in South Florida, and African Americans. Professor Floyd's research has appeared in *Environment and Behavior, Journal of Environmental Education, Journal of Leisure Research*, and *Leisure Sciences*. Dr. Floyd can be contacted at:

Dr. Myron F. Floyd

Texas Agricultural Experiment Station

Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences

Texas A&M University

College Station, Texas 77843-2261

Phone: (409) 845-5398 FAX: (409) 845-0446

e-mail: mfloyd@rpts.tamu.edu

About the Series

The purpose of the *Social Science Research Review* is to provide a basis for scientific understanding of specific issues critical to the management of the National Park System. Each paper presents a conceptual framework for understanding the issue, reviews methodologies used in relevant studies, and presents key findings from the published scientific literature, technical reports, and other documents. Each paper is peer-reviewed. The papers are *not* intended to provide specific policy guidelines or management recommendations.

The *Social Science Research Review* series is part of the National Park Service Social Science Program under the direction of Dr. Gary Machlis, Visiting Chief Social Scientist, and Dr. Michael Soukup, Associate Director for Natural Resource Stewardship and Science.

For more information on the *Social Science Research Review* series and/or the National Park Service Social Science Program, please contact:

Dr. Gary Machlis Visiting Chief Social Scientist National Park Service 1849 C Street, NW (3127) Washington, DC 20240

Phone: (202) 208-5391 e-mail: gmachlis@uidaho.edu http://www.nps.gov/socialscience